

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-11 are in the case. No amendments have been made herein.

Initially, Applicant understands, because of the absence of objection or rejection to the amendments to the Drawings submitted in the Amendment filed on January 5, 2007, that such amendments have been accepted by the Examiner and that the replacement sheet of Drawings submitted with such Amendment has been entered into the case. If such understanding is incorrect, Applicant respectfully requests that any such objection or rejection be presented in the next communication to Applicant in the case.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Peart in view of Moore et al., this rejection is respectfully traversed. Representative independent Claim 1 is directed to a computer system including, *inter alia*, a first data type table that stores application and file type associations, at least one removable memory module that can be inserted into the computer system, an application program stored on the removable memory module, a second data type table stored on the removable memory module, and a system computer software routine *to combine the first and second data type table to form a virtual extension table that is used to determine which application is to be used for a given file type*. In this way, a removable storage medium having an application program stored thereon may be inserted into a computer system, and the computer system may keep track of data types for the application on the removable storage medium, as well as data types for other applications in the system. In addition, by providing a system computer software routine that combines a first data type table stored on the computer system and a second data type table stored on the removable memory module, to form a virtual extension table that is used to determine which application is to be used for a given file type, excessive utilization of valuable computer system memory resources is avoided, thus allowing the invention to

be advantageously used, for example, on portable computer systems, in which such resources can be limited.

The patent to Peart apparently relates to a method for distributed program execution with file-type association in a client-server network. Peart is concerned about reducing performance degradation experienced by users other than a user causing a program to be executed on a client-server network. Not surprisingly, therefore, he neither teaches nor does he suggest any combining of data type tables, as he is apparently not concerned with excessive utilization of computer system memory resources. Instead, he teaches storing a mapping, specifying an association between a type of data file and an executable program, on a server node and using that mapping, possibly transferring such mapping in the process of doing so. But, there is no combining of data type tables.

The patent to Moore et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the patent to Peart. The patent to Moore et al. apparently relates to a method for automatically launching computer programs. The patent is completely silent on any table, and does not even discuss a list of file types. The patent is also completely silent on any combining or merging of even lists, much less combining or merging tables.

The other art of record is even less relevant.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is neither shown nor suggested by the patent to Peart, by the patent to Moore et al., nor, indeed, by any of the art of record, whether considered individually or in any combination, and for all of the above reasons Claim 1 is patentable. Claims 5 and 9, the only other independent claims in the case, contain similar limitations to those of Claim 1 discussed above, and therefore for the same reasons these claims are patentable as well. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 11 all depend, either directly or indirectly from Claim 1, 5 or 9, and are therefore allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein.

Wherefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite the patentably distinguishing features of the invention and that, taken together with the above remarks, the present application is now in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of the claims are requested at an early date.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees to the Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Dennis Moore/

J. Dennis Moore
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 28,885

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: (972) 917-5646
Fax: (972) 917-4418